

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 084 277

TM 003 285

AUTHOR Bergeth, Robert
TITLE A Descriptive Picture of Minneapolis Public Schools' Title I Special Learning and Behavior Problem Students 1971-1972.
INSTITUTION Minneapolis Public Schools, Minn. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
REPORT NO C-71-77
PUB DATE Sep 72
NOTE 33p.
EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement Tests; *Behavior Problems; Elementary Grades; *Elementary School Students; Emotional Problems; *Learning Difficulties; Mathematics Instruction; Public Schools; Reading Instruction; *Special Programs; Student Characteristics; Student Testing; Technical Reports

ABSTRACT

A descriptive picture of the students in the Minneapolis Public Schools' Special Learning and Behavior Problems (SLBP) Title I ESEA program is presented. Eighteen Title I teachers trained in special learning and behavior problems work in Target Area elementary schools. SLBP teachers provide individual instruction for children with severe learning and behavior problems which retard academic progress but do not necessitate placement in special education classes. The teachers work mainly on reading problems, but also work on math problems. The teachers also attempt to help a student who has some emotional or social problems. A total of 19 Title I schools with 325 SLBP children and 211 students who, according to teachers, could benefit by placement into the program were studied. The third and fourth grades had the largest number of students in the program. The typical SLBP student was a white male who had been enrolled in the program for about 10 months and who had a good chance of not living in a home where both parents resided. His parents had a strong possibility of receiving AFDC assistance, and there was a larger than average number of children in the family. He performs poorly on standardized achievement tests in reading and math. He does better on activities which are nonverbal in nature. Recommendations are made. (Author/CK)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Planning Development Federal Programs

TM 003 285



Educational Services

Minneapolis Public Schools

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

BOARD OF EDUCATION

W. Harry Davis, Chairman

Frank E. Adams Mrs. Marilyn A. Borea David W. Preus
Richard F. Allen Philip A. Olson Stuart W. Rider, Jr.

Superintendent of Schools

John B. Davis, Jr.

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Special School District No. 1
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

An Equal Opportunity Employer

ED 084277

Minneapolis Public Schools

A DESCRIPTIVE PICTURE OF
MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS' TITLE I
SPECIAL LEARNING AND
BEHAVIOR PROBLEM STUDENTS
1971-1972

Robert Bergeth, Ph. D.
Title I Evaluator

Ideas expressed in this report do not necessarily reflect the official position of the Minneapolis Public School Administration nor the Minneapolis School Board.

September 1972
Order number C-71-77

Research and Evaluation Department
Educational Services Division
807 N. E. Broadway
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55413

Minneapolis Public Schools

A DESCRIPTIVE PICTURE OF
MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS' TITLE I
SPECIAL LEARNING AND
BEHAVIOR PROBLEM STUDENTS
1971-1972

Summary

See Page

This report presents a descriptive picture of the students in the Minneapolis Public Schools' Special Learning and Behavior Problems (SLBP) Title I ESEA program. It also describes a number of students who teachers said could benefit from placement into the SLBP program. The program operates under the direction and coordination of the schools' Special Education Department.

1

Eighteen Title I teachers trained in special learning and behavior problems work in Target Area elementary schools. SLBP teachers provide individual instruction for children with severe learning and behavior problems which retard academic progress but do not necessitate placement in special education classes. Generally a student spends up to an hour in a group of 1-3 students. The teachers work mainly on reading problems but may also work with a student on math problems. The teachers also attempt to help a student who has some emotional or social problems.

1

Nineteen Title I schools with 325 SLBP children and 211 students who, according to teachers, could benefit by placement into the SLBP program were involved in the study.

2

The typical SLBP student had been enrolled in the SLBP program for about 10 months as of March 1972. The third and fourth grades had the largest number of students in the SLBP program. The typical student was male (76%) and white (62%). He also had a good chance of not living in a home where both parents resided (46%), his parent(s) had a strong possibility of receiving AFDC assistance (47%), and there was a larger than average number of children in the family (4.7). He may also have repeated a grade (28% did) and has attended two different schools since kindergarten. He had missed about 10 days of school each year. He performs poorly on standardized achievement tests in reading and math. While he performs better on math tests than he does in reading, he still performs considerably below average in math. He does better on activities which are nonverbal in nature than verbal. When he initially entered school, he had low normal readiness for doing first grade work according to the Metropolitan Readiness Test (MRT).

13-18

What has been described is the typical SLBP student. However, many SLBP students do not fit this description. For example, approximately 5% of the SLBP students demonstrated their ability to perform well on standardized tests. Many have poor school attendance habits.

19-20

Many other students (211) also fit closely to the SLBP student description and were recommended by their teachers as being able to benefit from placement into the SLBP program. 20

A number of recommendations were made. 20

September 1972

Research and Evaluation Department

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to two members of the Planning, Development and Federal Programs Department who assisted in collecting much of the information contained in this report. Special thanks are due Jean Hudson and Ruby Riney for their assistance.

Appreciation is extended to Elmira Hendrix of the Special Education Department who was most cooperative and helpful throughout the study.

Finally, the data could not have been collected without the excellent cooperation of the Special Learning and Behavior Problems teachers and social workers who provided the information contained in this study.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Summary	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Listing of Tables	vi
Listing of Figures	vi
Overview	1
Objectives of the Study	2
Data Collection Procedures	2
Date of Entrance Into SLBP Program	3
Biographical Description of SLBP Students and Those Regular Classroom Students Who Might Benefit From SLBP Programs	4
Attendance in School	6
Citywide Test Results for SLBP Students and Those Students in Need of SLBP	7
Summary and Recommendations	19
Appendix A	21

Listing of Tables

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Month and Year Students Enrolled in SLBP Program	3
2 Biographical Data by Grades for SLBP Students.	5
3 Biographical Data by Grade for Students in Need of SLBP Program.	5
4 Attendance Data for SLBP and Regular Students.	7
5 Citywide Tests Results for SLBP Students Who Attend School in the Target Area.	8
6 Citywide Tests Results for Students in Need of SLBP Programs Who Attend School in the Target Area.	9
7 Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students Who Took the Metropolitan Readiness Test in First Grade	12
8 Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students Who Took the Bond-Balow-Hoyt Development Reading Test in Second Grade	12
9 Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students Who Took the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test in Third Grade	14
10 Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students Who Took the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests and the Iowa Tests of Basic Skills Modern Math Supplement in Fourth Grade	15
11 Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students Who Took the Lorge-Thorndike Verbal and Nonverbal Intelligence Tests in Fourth Grade.	16
12 Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students Who Took the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests in Fifth Grade.	17
13 Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students Who Took the Gates-MacGinitie Test of Basic Skills in Sixth Grade . .	18

Listing of Figures

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 SLBP Students' Citywide Test Grade Equivalent Scores Based on Mean Raw Scores.	11

Minneapolis Public Schools

A DESCRIPTIVE PICTURE OF
MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS' TITLE I
SPECIAL LEARNING AND
BEHAVIOR PROBLEM STUDENTS
1971-1972

Overview

This report presents a descriptive picture of the students in the Minneapolis Public Schools' Special Learning and Behavior Problems (SLBP) Title I ESEA program which operates under the direction and coordination of the Special Education Department. It also presents a descriptive picture of a group of students who were identified by teachers as being in need of SLBP programs.

Eighteen Title I teachers, trained in special learning and behavior problems, work in Target Area elementary schools. SLBP teachers provide individual instruction for children with severe learning and behavior problems which retard academic progress but do not necessitate placement in special education classes. Generally a student spends from 30 minutes to an hour a day in a group of 1-3 students. The teachers work mainly on reading problems but may also work with a student who has math problems. The teachers also attempt to help a student who has some emotional or social problems.

The primary objective of the SLBP program is to help students with learning or behavior(s) problems work his way back into the regular educational program.

Students who were placed into the SLBP program usually were initially identified and recommended for placement into the program by their classroom teachers. Before being placed into the program, the students were tested by a school psychologist to determine whether they could benefit from SLBP placement. A screening committee which is usually, but not always, made up of some combination of the SLBP teacher, regular teacher, principal and social worker then determines whether placement is desirable and if there is room in the program for the student. Since an SLBP teacher may work with a maximum of 15 students only - according to State Department of Education directions - many students who can't be placed into a program because there isn't room are placed on a "waiting list" for future placement into the program when a vacancy occurs.

Nineteen Title I schools with 325 SLBP children and 211 students who teachers said could benefit by placement into the SLBP program were involved in this survey.

Objectives of the Study

This report has attempted to provide answers to the following questions regarding the SLBP program:

1. Which month(s) were SLBP students most likely to have been placed in the program?
2. How long have students been in the program?
3. Which grades have the most students in the program?
4. What is the race background of the students?
5. What is the family status of the students?
6. How many of the students' families receive AFDC assistance?
7. How many students have ever repeated a grade?
8. What kind of student mobility is there from school to school?
9. How many children were in the students' family?
10. What kinds of attendance patterns can be discerned?
11. How well do the students do on the citywide testing program?
12. Approximately how many students are in need of SLBP programs, and are their characteristics similar to students now in the SLBP program?

Data Collection Procedures

Nineteen Title I elementary schools participated in the study.¹ Data on SLBP students in these schools were collected from December 1971 through the middle of March 1972. The number of SLBP students involved in each school ranged from 8 to 28. Information on all students was not collected in several schools where large numbers of SLBP students were involved. In these cases approximately 25% of the students were selected for inclusion in the study. This sampling was done to prevent the overall picture of Title I from being unduly influenced by one or two schools with large numbers of students and also because of the heavy burden placed on schools with large numbers of SLBP students.

Appendix A contains the questionnaire which was used to collect the data from the SLBP teachers and social workers in the schools. In some schools the

¹Adams, Bancroft, Bethune, Bremer, Clinton, Corcoran, Greeley, Hall, Harrison, Hawthorne, Hay, Irving, Lowell, Lyndale, Mann, Seward, Sheridan, Whittier, Willard.

questionnaires were filled out by the SLBP teachers and social workers and in other schools the data were collected by several members of the Research and Evaluation and Federal Projects Departments.

The schools were also asked if they had a "waiting list" of students who might benefit from placement into the SLBP program. Where lists existed, the data were collected on those students.

Date of Entrance Into SLBP Program

Table 1 presents the data for the month and year that students entered the SLBP program.

The data presented in Table 1 were listed in rank order by number of enrollees. Thus, most of the students (44%) at the time of the survey had enrolled in the SLBP program during September 1971. The next highest enrollment period was September 1970 when 14% had enrolled, then September 1969 when 8% had enrolled, etc. Two thirds of all students in the study were enrolled during the month of September.

Table 1
Month and Year Students Enrolled in SLBP Program
N=314

Month	Year	N	%
September	1971	137	44
September	1970	43	14
September	1969	24	8
November	1971	15	5
October	1971	11	4
October	1970	11	4
November	1970	9	3
February	1971	9	3
January	1971	9	3
December	1971	8	3
March	1971	8	3
Other ¹		27	9
Total		311	103 ²

¹From one to three students were enrolled in 17 months other than those listed above. The earliest enrollment was September 1968.

²Total exceeds 100 because of rounding.

Students enter the SLBP program at many different times. Beginning with the earliest enrollment, September 1968, students have entered the program in 28 different time periods when entrance is determined by month and year.

Biographical Description of SLBP Students
and Those Regular Classroom Students Who
Might Benefit From SLBP Programs

The people who are charged with the responsibility of managing or supervising the Title I SLBP program take into consideration the following kinds of questions:

1. How many students are involved in the SLBP program at the various grade levels?
2. What is the sex breakdown for the various grade levels as well as the total number of males and females?
3. What is the racial composition at various grade levels?
4. What is the family status of the children involved?
5. What percent of the SLBP students' families receive AFDC assistance?
6. How many children have ever repeated a grade?
7. How many different schools have the students attended?
8. How many children are in the family?

Answers to these and other questions can be found by carefully analyzing Table 2 on page 5, which presents the biographical information for the SLBP students.

There were 325 students surveyed. Grade 3 had the most students, then grades 4, 5, and 2. Grades 1 and 6 had by far the fewest students (less than half of the other grades).

Most of the students were male (76%). Males predominate at each grade ranging from 55% at grade 1 to 91% at grade six.

Sixty-two percent of the children were white, 21% black and 16% Indian. Only 1% were Spanish and there were no Orientals. Thus, 38% of the students were from minority groups. The minority elementary student population for the school district is 14%, based on the pupil sight count of October 19, 1971.

Fifty-four percent of the students lived with both parents, 41% with one parent and 5% had some other arrangement. Thus, nearly half of the students (46%) did not have a "normal" family status.

Nearly half (47%) of the students' families were receiving AFDC assistance.

The families were larger than average with nearly five children in each family.

Table 2
Biographical Data by Grade for SLAP Students

Grade	N	SEX		R A C E				Spanish Surnamed				Family Status Child Lives With:				Does Family Receive AFDC Assistance?				Has This Child Ever Repeated a Grade?				Number of Children in Family		Number of Schools Attended
		Male Female		Black	Indian	Oriental	Spanish	Other	Both Parents	One Parent	Foster	Other	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Mean	Mean						
		%	%																		%	%	%	%	%	
1	22	55%	45%	32%	16%	-	-	53%	43%	48%	5%	5%	59%	41%	40%	60%	3.6	1.1								
2	59	75	25	24	15	-	-	61	53	45	-	2	48	52	17	83	4.4	1.7								
3	80	68	33	26	18	-	3	53	63	34	1	3	41	59	33	67	5.0	1.8								
4	79	78	22	24	14	-	3	60	60	35	1	4	38	62	26	74	4.8	2.1								
5	60	85	15	10	13	-	-	77	41	51	5	3	60	40	29	71	4.6	2.6								
6	22	91	9	14	18	-	-	68	48	52	-	-	47	53	35	65	5.4	3.0								
total	325	76	24	21	16	-	1	62	54	41	2	3	47	55	28	72	4.7	2.0								

Table 3
Biographical Data by Grade for Students in Need of SLAP Program

Grade	N	SEX		R A C E					Family Status Child Lives With:				Does Family Receive AFDC Assistance?		Has This Child Ever Repeated a Grade?		Number of Children in Family		Number of Schools Attended
		Male %	Female %	Bl- & %	Indian %	Oriental %	Spanish Surname %	Other %	Both Parents %	One Parent %	Foster %	Other %	Yes %	No %	Yes %	No %	Mean	Mean	
1	22	59	41	59	-	-	-	41	36	41	9	14	62	38	14	86	3.8	1.1	
2	15	58	42	21	26	-	-	53	50	44	-	6	57	43	21	79	3.8	1.3	
3	41	58	43	20	13	-	5	63	56	41	2	-	44	56	15	85	5.1	1.5	
4	55	63	37	23	11	-	-	66	60	36	2	2	22	78	15	85	4.5	1.6	
5	44	71	29	32	11	-	-	57	53	44	-	2	36	64	14	86	3.9	2.6	
6	28	64	36	14	7	-	4	75	61	36	-	4	36	64	23	77	5.3	2.5	
Total	211	63	36	26	11	-	2	61	55	40	2	3	39	61	16	84	4.5	1.8	

Most of the children had attended more than one school. The overall mean was 2.0. In addition, nearly a third (28%) had repeated a grade.

Thus, the typical SLBP student was probably male and white. He also had a good chance of not living in a normal family setting, his parents probably received AFDC assistance, and had a large family. He may also have repeated a grade and may have attended more than one school.

Regular Students Who Possibly Could Benefit From an SLBP Program

Table 3 on page 5 presents the biographical data for students who might benefit from placement into an SLBP program. If one compares Table 3 with Table 2 the following observations can be made.

First, there were fairly large numbers (211) of students who teachers and social workers feel could benefit from SLBP programs. Most (63%) are male and white (61%). Forty-five percent don't have a normal family status. Thirty-nine percent received AFDC assistance, live in large families (4.5 children in family), and have attended almost two schools (1.8). Students in need of SLBP have a profile similar to the SLBP child, although fewer students in need of SLBP (16%) than SLBP students (28%) have repeated a grade.

Attendance in School

Table 4 on page 7 reports the attendance data for both SLBP students and those students who were identified as being in need of SLBP programs. With the exception of SLBP 5th graders, these students were in school on the average, 90% or more of the time. If one examines those students who have missed 20 or more days, with the exception of SLBP 5th graders, where 50% missed 20 or more days, it can be observed that between 14-26% of the students by grade in both groups miss this many days. There were also many students in both groups that miss very few days (0-4). The range was 28-38% of the students in this category when each grade was examined. Thus, while the overall attendance was fairly good and was similar to the district average, there was a fairly large number of students who had poor attendance. The median days absent by grade ranges from 8-10 days absent for both groups, with the exception of 18 SLBP 5th graders whose median days absent was 17.

The next section presents the test results for those students who had taken standardized achievement tests which are part of the citywide testing program.

Table 4
Attendance Data for SLBP and Regular Students

Student Group	Grade	N	Days Absent ¹					Median Days Absent	Attendance Percent
			30+	20-29	10-19	5-9	0-4		
SLBP	1	252	10%	16%	24%	21%	28%	10	90
	2	209	8	9	26	22	34	8	92
	3	145	9	7	28	18	38	8	91
	4	76	11	12	28	20	30	9	92
	5	18	22	28	11	11	26	17	87
Regular Students in Need of SLBP	1	150	12%	9%	28%	23%	28%	9	90
	2	145	6	9	28	26	31	8	92
	3	114	9	8	22	26	35	7	93
	4	70	7	7	29	26	31	8	93
	5	29	7	14	31	14	34	9	93

¹In some instances percent totals do not equal 100 because of rounding.

Citywide Test Results for SLBP Students and
Those Students in Need of SLBP

This section reports the test scores from the citywide testing program for both SLBP and those students who possibly could benefit by being enrolled in the SLBP program. Tables 5 and 6 on pages 8 and 9 indicate the name of each test, grade and date when the tests were given, as well as the number who took each test, their mean raw score, grade equivalent score, and the publisher percentile standing for the group.

Table 5 indicates that for 246 SLBP students who had taken the Metropolitan Readiness Test in first grade, the average SLBP student ranked at the 26th percentile and had low normal readiness for first grade.

The test scores were considerably below average when grades 3-6 were examined. The average percentile rank was at or below the 10th percentile for each test with the exception of the Lorge-Thorndike Nonverbal test. Thus, the average or typical SLBP student scored poorly in math and reading at all grade levels.

It was interesting to note the students' performance on the Nonverbal Lorge-Thorndike Tests. The students scored the best (22nd percentile) on this

Table 5
Citywide Tests Results For SLBP Students
Who Attend School in the Target Area

Grade Test Given In	Month Test Given	Name of Test	N	Mean R.S.	Grade Equiv- alent	Publisher Percentile
1	Sept	Metropolitan Readiness Test	246	42	Low Normal Readiness 1st Grade	26%
2	Oct	Bond-Balow-Hoyt Developmental Reading Test				
		Word Recognition	174	7	1.6	-
		Comprehending Signi- ficant Ideas	162	8	1.9	-
		Comprehending Specific Instructions	161	5	1.7	-
3	Oct	Gates-MacGinitie				
		Vocabulary	177	14	1.6	7
		Comprehension	169	10	1.6	8
4	Feb	Gates-MacGinitie				
		Vocabulary	88	11	2.8	5
		Comprehension	83	10	2.5	7
		ITBS Modern Math	72	8	2.8	4
	Nov & Feb	Lorge-Thorndike				
		Verbal	80	17	2.2	8
		Nonverbal	77	29	2.6	22
5	Oct	Gates-MacGinitie				
		Vocabulary	69	12	2.9	5
		Comprehension	67	12	2.7	7
6	Oct	Gates-MacGinitie				
		Vocabulary	19	14	3.2	4
		Comprehension	18	10	2.6	2
		ITBS Modern Math	17	10	4.4	10

Table 6
Citywide Tests Results For Students in Need of SLBP
Programs Who Attend School in the Target Area

Grade Test Given In	Month Test Given	Name of Test	N	Mean R.S.	Grade Equiv- alent	Percentile
1	Sept.	Metropolitan Readiness Test	153	44	Low Normal Readiness 1st Grade	29%
2	Oct.	Bond-Balow-Hoyt Developmental Reading Test				
		Word Recongition	118	7	1.6	
		Comprehending Signifi- cant Ideas	112	7	1.7	
		Comprehending Specific Instructions	113	4	1.5	
3	Oct.	Gates-MacGinitie				
		Vocabulary	122	14	1.6	7
		Comprehension	120	11	1.7	12
4	Feb.	Gates-MacGinitie				
		Vocabulary	66	11	2.8	5
		Comprehension	64	11	2.6	8
		ITBS Modern Math	61	9	2.9	5
	Nov. & Feb.	Lorge-Thorndike				
		Verbal	72	20	2.5	13
		Nonverbal	66	30	2.7	24
5	Oct.	Gates-MacGinitie				
		Vocabulary	67	15	3.3	10
		Comprehension	65	13	2.9	8
6	Oct.	Gates-MacGinitie				
		Vocabulary	25	19	3.9	12
		Comprehension	25	15	3.1	8
		ITBS Modern Math	25	9	4.2	8

test perhaps because it required a limited amount of reading ability.

Figure 1 on page 11 presents a graphic picture of the relative standing of SLBP students for the various tests included in the elementary schools' citywide testing program when grade equivalent scores were used as the criteria. This information was also presented in Table 5 and will not be discussed here.

Table 6 indicates the test results for the students in need of SLBP. The test results for the group are very similar to the SLBP group. The students as a group had low normal readiness test scores for entrance into first grade on the Metropolitan Readiness Tests. The students also scored far below grade level on all other tests. With the exception of the 4th grade nonverbal score, the mean raw score placed the group on the various tests at or below the 12th percentile. It is again interesting to note that the students did quite well on the Lorge-Thorndike Nonverbal Test (22nd percentile ranking) compared to their performance on the other tests.

In summary, the SLBP students and the group of students identified as being in need of SLBP help scored, as groups, very similarly on all the tests which included reading, math and I. Q. tests.

Test Score Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students

Tables 7 through 13 provide a raw score frequency breakdown for SLBP students who took the tests in the citywide testing program.

Table 7 on page 12 indicates that for those SLBP students who took the Metropolitan Readiness Tests, 10% scored at high normal or superior readiness for entrance into first grade and 43% scored at or above average readiness for 1st grade. Thirteen percent were considered low readiness and 52% were below average readiness for 1st grade work. Since this test doesn't require reading ability, it is interesting to note the large percentage of SLBP students who were classified as being able to do first grade work.

Table 8 on page 12 presents a frequency test score distribution for SLBP students who took the Bond-Balow-Hoyt Developmental Tests (BBHDT) in second grade.

Thirteen percent of the SLBP students performed near or above grade level on the Word Recognition Test while 36% and 15% scored near or above grade level on the Comprehending Significant Ideas and Comprehending Specific Instructions Tests respectively. Thus, a fairly large number of students performed at or above grade level as measured by the BBHDT. The median grade equivalents for the three tests were 1.5, 1.6 and 1.4.




Figure 1. SLBP Students' Citywide Test Grade Equivalent Scores Based on Mean Raw Scores

Table 7
Frequency Distributuon for SLBP Students Who Took
the Metropolitan Readiness Test in First Grade
N=246

Raw Score Range	N	%	Readiness for First Grade Status	Publisher Percentile Range
77-84	4	2%	Superior	92-98%
64-76	19	8	High Normal	69-91
45-63	82	33	Average	31-67
24-44	109	44	Low Normal	7-29
Below 24	32	13	Low	1-6

Table 8
Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students Who
Took the Bond-Balow-Hoyt Developmental
Reading Test in Second Grade

Test	Raw Score Range	N	%	Grade Equivalent Range ¹
Word Recognition	28-34	2	1%	3.0-3.5
N=174	21-27	5	3	2.5-2.9
	14-20	15	9	2.0-2.5
	7-13	56	32	1.6-2.0
	0-6	96	55	Below 1.3-1.5
	Median	5	-	1.5
Comprehending Significant Ideas	25-38	4	3	3.1-3.5
N=159	14-24	12	8	2.3-3.0
	9-13	39	25	2.0-2.3
	5-8	37	23	1.4-1.9
	0-4	67	42	Below 1.3-1.3
	Median	6	-	1.6
Comprehending Specific Instruction	19-26	3	2	3.0-above 3.5
N=157	13-18	9	6	2.5-2.9
	9-12	11	7	2.1-2.4
	4-8	47	30	1.5-2.0
	0-3	87	55	Below 1.3-1.4
Median	3	-	-	1.4

¹Grade equivalent overlap in some cases because a grade equivalent score may be the same for two different raw scores.

Since these tests do not report grade levels below 1.3, it is difficult to say what the reading level was for many students since they scored so low as not to be measured by the test. Needless to say, there were many students who did poorly on the test.

Table 9 on page 14 presents the frequency distribution of test scores for SLBP students who took the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test in third grade.

The median grade equivalent score was 1.5 on both the Vocabulary and Comprehension Test. Thus, the median student was approximately 1.6 grade levels behind at the time of testing. The percentile rank for each test was 2 and 4 respectively. Twelve students (7%) scored considerably above average on the Vocabulary Test while 10 students (6%) scored above average on the Comprehension Test. It is interesting to note the grade equivalent range for both tests at the highest level. Several students on both tests did very well. One student scored at the 99th percentile on the Vocabulary Test and one scored at the 82nd percentile on the Comprehension Test.

Many did very poorly on the tests. Seventy-two percent scored at or below the 12th percentile on the Vocabulary Test and 76% scored at or below the 14th percentile on the Comprehension Test.

Table 10 on page 15 reports the results of those SLBP students who took the Gates-MacGinitie and ITBS Modern Math Test in the fourth grade.

The median raw score was 10 for the Vocabulary Test which has a grade equivalent score of 2.6. The median grade equivalent scores for the Comprehension and Math tests were 2.4 and 2.8 respectively. Thus, the average SLBP student in the fourth grade was almost two years below grade level at the time he was tested.

All SLBP students scored below grade level on the Vocabulary test and only a few scored at or above grade level on the Comprehension and Math Tests.

Many students had such severe reading problems that the tests really didn't indicate their actual level. For example, 29% had a raw score range of 0-6 on the Comprehension Test. A raw score of 6 had a grade equivalent score of 2.1 -- the lowest reported score provided by the publisher. Since many of the students should have gotten a raw score of at least 6 by chance marking, the score at the lower range is probably meaningless since these students in all probability read at a much lower level or not at all. It is also possible that the students did not try to answer the test questions or didn't understand the directions.

Table 10
Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students Who Took the
Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests and the
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills Modern
Math Supplement in Fourth Grade

Test	Raw Score Range	N	%	Grade Equivalent Range	Publisher Percentile Range
Vocabulary	18-20	6	7%	3.7-4.0	27-34
N=87	13-17	17	20	3.1-3.6	10-21
	8-12	37	43	2.4-2.9	2-7
	0-7	27	31	Below 2.0-2.3	1
Median	10	-	-	2.6	4
Comprehension	22-42	5	6%	3.9-7.2	34-88
N=83	16-21	4	5	3.2-3.8	18-31
	11-15	27	33	2.6-3.1	8-16
	7-10	23	28	2.2-2.5	3-7
	0-6	24	29	Below 2.1-2.1	1-4
Median	9	-	-	2.4	5
ITBS	15-18	4	6%	4.0-4.5	35-51
Modern	11-14	15	21	3.2-3.8	10-28
Math	8-10	19	26	2.8-3.0	4-6
N=72	1-7	34	47	1.4-2.7	1-3
Median	8	-	-	2.8	4

bottom range of normal I. Q. Only 16% of the verbal scores were at or above an I. Q. of 83.

Thus, it is quite apparent that SLBP students perform considerably better on nonverbal tasks than they do on verbal tasks. This difference probably is due in large measure to their inability to read well. However, SLBP students still perform poorly on nonverbal tasks, thus the difference is relative.

Table 12 on page 17 presents the frequency distribution of test scores for SLBP students who took the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary and Comprehension Reading Tests in 5th grade.

Table 11
Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students
Who Took the Lorge-Thorndike Verbal and
Nonverbal Intelligence Tests in
Fourth Grade

Student Group and Test	Raw Score Range	N	%	Grade Equivalent Range	Age Equivalent ¹	Publisher Percentile Range	IQ Range
Verbal N=80	31-49	5	6%	3.5-4.8	8-9to10-1	33-67	88-101
	25-30	8	10	3.0-3.4	8-4to8-8	22-31	83-87
	19-24	20	25	2.4-2.9	7-10to8-3	11-20	78-82
	13-18	22	28	1.7-2.3	7-3to7-9	4-10	72-77
	7-12	17	21	Below 1.2 to 1.5	6-3to7-2	1-3	64-70
	1-6	8	10	Below 1.2	5-0to6-0	1	56-62
Median	16	-	-	2.1	7-7	7	75
Nonverbal N=77	48-69	7	9%	5.2-11.2	10-5to16-4	68-99	107-134
	39-47	10	13	4.0-5.0	9-2to10-3	47-65	97-105
	30-38	18	23	2.7-3.8	8-0to9-1	24-44	87-96
	21-29	22	29	1.6-2.6	6-9to7-10	8-22	76-86
	12-20	15	19	.6-1.5	5-9to6-8	2-7	62-75
	3-11	5	6	Below .2 to .5	5-0to5-8	1-2	Below 50-61
Median	28	-	-	2.5	7-8	20	85

¹Grade equivalent overlap in some cases because a grade equivalent score may be the same for two different raw scores.

For 71 fifth graders, the median raw score on the Vocabulary Test was 11 which has a grade equivalent of 2.8. The percentile rank was four. According to this test, five students (7%) had test scores in the 4.7 to 5.6 grade equivalent range which would indicate that these students were working near or slightly above grade level.

Most students (84%) were at least 1.4 grade equivalent scores behind. These students ranked below the 17th percentile on publisher norms.

Similar results can be observed by viewing the Comprehension Test results. Only three students (4%) had a grade equivalent score near what an average student might expect to have. Most students (68%) scored so poorly on the test as to be hardly measureable (below the 6th percentile and below a grade equivalent score of 3.0). The median grade equivalent score for the group was 2.5 and the median percentile rank was four.

Table 12
Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students Who
Took the Gates-MacGinitie Reading
Tests in Fifth Grade

Test	Raw Score Range	N	%	Grade Equivalent Range	Publisher Percentile Range
Vocabulary N=71	25-30	5	7%	4.7-5.6	38-62
	19-24	7	10	3.9-4.5	18-34
	13-18	14	20	3.1-3.7	7-16
	7-12	34	49	2.3-2.9	1-4
	1-6	11	15	Below 2.0-2.1	1
Median	11	-	-	2.8	4
Comprehension N=67	28-36	3	4%	4.6-5.6	24-42
	21-27	4	6	3.8-4.5	15-21
	14-20	14	21	3.0-3.7	7-14
	7-13	27	40	2.2-2.9	1-5
	0-6	19	28	Below 2.1-2.1	1
Median	10	-	-	2.5	4

It is quite apparent that most of the SLBP students who took the Gates-MacGinitie Tests in fifth grade did very poorly. However, it is important to note that on both tests there were some students who did quite well.

Table 13 on page 18 indicates the progress made by fifth grade SLBP students on the Gates-MacGinitie Vocabulary and Comprehension Tests as well as their Math progress as measured by the ITBS Modern Math Test. The median grade equivalent scores for the Vocabulary, Comprehension and Math Tests were 2.9, 2.6 and 4.4 respectively. The percentile standings were 3, 4, and 10.

Thus the students did poorly in reading but performed better in math although not particularly well.

Table 13
Frequency Distribution for SLBP Students
Who Took the Gates-MacGinitie and Iowa
Test of Basic Skills Modern
Math Test in Sixth Grade

Test	Raw Score Range	N	%	Grade Equivalent Range	Publisher Percentile Range
Vocabulary N=19 Median	26-33	2	11%	4.8-6.3	24-54
	18-25	2	11	3.7-4.7	10-21
	10-17	10	53	2.6-3.6	1-8
	2-9	5	26	Below 2.0-2.5	1
	12	-	-	2.9	3
Comprehension N=18 Median	17-21	3	17	3.3-3.8	10-14
	12-16	5	28	2.7-3.2	4-10
	7-11	4	22	2.2-2.6	1-4
	2-6	6	33	Below 2.1	1
	11	-	-	2.6	4
Math N=17 Median	13-16	6	35	5.0-5.6	22-36
	8-12	6	35	4.0-4.8	5-18
	3-7	5	29	2.8-3.8	1-3
	10	-	-	4.4	10

Summary and Recommendations

This report presents a descriptive picture of the students in the Minneapolis Public Schools Special Learning and Behavior Problems (SLBP) Title I ESEA program. It also describes a number of students who teachers said could benefit from placement into the SLBP program. The program operates under the direction and coordination of the schools' Special Education Department.

Eighteen Title I teachers trained in special learning and behavior problems, work in Target Area Elementary schools. SLBP teachers provide individual instruction for children with severe learning and behavior problems which retard academic progress but do not necessitate placement in special education classes. Generally a student spends up to an hour in a group of 1-3 students. The teachers work mainly on reading problems but may also work with a student on math problems. The teachers also attempt to help a student who has some emotional or social problems.

Nineteen Title I schools with 325 SLBP children and 211 students, who according to teachers could benefit by placement into the SLBP program, were involved in the study.

The typical SLBP student had been enrolled in the SLBP program for about 10 months as of March 1972. The third and fourth grades had the largest number of students in the SLBP program. The typical student was male (76%) and white (62%). He also had a good chance of not living in a home where both parents resided (46%), his parent(s) had a strong possibility of receiving AFDC assistance (47%), and there was a larger than average number of children in the family (4.7). He may also have repeated a grade (28% did) and has attended two different schools since kindergarten. He had missed about 10 days of school each year. He performs poorly on standardized achievement tests in reading and math. While he performs better on math tests than he does in reading, he still performs considerably below average in math. He does better on activities which are nonverbal in nature than verbal. When he initially entered school, he had low normal readiness for doing first grade work according to the Metropolitan Readiness Test.

What has been described is the typical SLBP student. However, many SLBP students do not fit into this description. For example, 43% had average or better readiness for entrance into the first grade and 10% scored in the high normal and superior readiness for first grade work as measured by the Metropolitan Readiness Test. The same pattern holds up in second grade. Thirteen percent scored near or above grade level on the Bond-Balow-Hoyt Developmental Reading Test in Word Recognition while 36% scored near or above grade level in

their ability to comprehend specific instructions. At the start of third grade, fewer students scored near or above grade level. However, while the percentage is fewer, there were still 4-5 percent who seemed to perform average or better in vocabulary and comprehension.

The same picture occurs in 4th, 5th and 6th grade. While the percentages aren't as great, there are still 4-5 percent of the students who perform near or above grade level in reading.

This report also described a number (211) of students who have been identified by the school staff as being able to benefit from placement into the SLBP program. The typical student is quite similar to the SLBP student who was described earlier; thus, he won't be described here. The point is that there are many students who possibly could benefit from placement into SLBP programs and thus possibly should receive priority over some students who are in the SLBP program.

Recommendations

1. Ninety-five percent of the SLBP students, on the basis of achievement test scores, appear to be well placed in the program. There appears to be about five percent who were in the program and who performed near grade level on standardized tests. Therefore, there may be small numbers of students who should be replaced by other students more in need of SLBP program help. A review of these high scoring students should be made to determine if they should remain in the program.

2. Many SLBP students have a history of poor school attendance. This problem shows up early in their school experiences. For example, when the present SLBP students (grades 2-6) were in first grade, 26% missed 20 or more days of school. It is very likely that many of these same students continue having poor school attendance as they progress through school. Therefore, SLBP teachers and supervisory personnel should take a good look at this problem to see what could be done about improving school attendance particularly in first grade.

3. While developing this report it was difficult to get a clear cut picture of what the goals and objectives of the Title I SLBP program were. The primary objectives of the program, as reported to the writer, was to help a student with a learning or behavior(s) problem work his way back into the regular educational program. This statement is rather global and doesn't say what the criteria are for determining when a student is ready for assuming full time classroom responsibilities. Thus, it appears that a review of Title I SLBP program objectives should be made and stated in terms that everyone understands.

Appendix

(1 - 6) (Leave blank) — SNAP Number

(7 - 36) _____ Student's Name (Please
Last First Middle print)
Initial

(37 - 42) _____ Student's Birthdate
Month Day Year (Please use numbers)

(43 - 45) _____
(Leave blank) School _____

(46 - 60) _____ Classroom teachers last name

(61 - 75) _____ SLBP teachers last name if applicable

(75 - 80) _____ Project Number
(Leave blank)

(7) Is this child presently an (check which one applies)
1 SLBP student or
2 a regular classroom student

Month Year
(Please use numbers)

Month Year
(Please use numbers)

(16) Grade in school (check one)

☐ 1 First

☐ 2 Second

☐ 3 Third

☐ 4 Fourth

☐ 5 Fifth

☐ 6 Sixth

(17) Sex (check one)
1 Male
2 Female

(18) Race (check one)

☐ 1 Black

☐ 2 Indian

☐ 3 Oriental

☐ 4 Spanish Surnamed

☐ 5 All other

(19 - 20) _____ Number of brothers and sisters

(21) Child lives with (check one only)

 1 both parents

 2 one parent

 3 foster

 4 other (describe)

SLRP Student Information (continued)

- (22) Is family on AFDC?
 ___ 1 Yes
 ___ 2 No
- (23) ___ How many different schools has this child attended?
- (24) Has this child ever repeated a grade?
 ___ 1 Yes
 ___ 2 No
- (25 - 26) ___ Raw Score Grade 1 Metropolitan Total Score
 Grade 2 Bond, Balow, Hoyt Developmental Reading Test Form L-1
 Word Recognition
 Comprehending Significant Ideas
 Comprehending Specific Instruction
- (33 - 34) ___ Grade 3 Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, Primary C, Form 2
 Vocabulary raw score
 Comprehension raw score
- (37 - 38) ___ Grade 4 Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, Vocabulary and Comprehension
 Survey D, Form 1 M
 Vocabulary raw score
 Comprehension raw score
- (41 - 42) ___ Grade 4 Modern Mathematics Supplement to Iowa Test of Basic Skills
 Total Raw Score
- (43 - 44) ___ Grade 4 Lorge-Thorndike Test: Verbal and nonverbal, Level 3, Form A
 Raw Score Verbal
 Raw Score Nonverbal
- (47 - 48) ___ Grade 5 Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test: Vocabulary and Comprehension,
 Survey D, Form 1 M
 Vocabulary Raw Score
 Comprehension Raw Score
- (51 - 52) ___ Grade 6 Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test: Vocabulary and Comprehension,
 Survey D, Form 1 M
 Vocabulary Raw Score
 Comprehension Raw Score
- (55 - 56) ___ Grade 6 Modern Mathematics Supplement to Iowa Tests of Basic Skills
 Raw Score
- Wide Range Achievement Test Raw Scores for Reading and Math.
 If the test has been given more than once indicate both scores
 and give the dates of administration
- (57 - 58) ___ Reading Raw Score 1st administration
- (59 - 60) ___ Arithmetic Raw Score " "
- (61 - 64) ___ Date when Wide Range 1st administered
 Month Year (Use numbers)
- (65 - 66) ___ Reading Raw Score 2nd administration
- (67 - 68) ___ Arithmetic Raw Score " "
- (69 - 72) ___ Date when Wide Range given 2nd time
 Month Year (Use numbers)
- (75 - 80) ___ Project Number

 Name of person completing this
 form.

 Position

 Date

Pupil Attendance Record

(1 - 6) _____ SNAF Number
(Leave blank)

Name _____ (Please Print)
Last First Middle Initial

School _____

(7 - 10) _____ Grade 1 Days Present

(11 - 14) _____ Grade 1 Days Absent

(15 - 18) _____ Grade 2 Days Present

(19 - 22) _____ Grade 2 Days Absent

(23 - 26) _____ Grade 3 Days Present

(27 - 30) _____ Grade 3 Days Absent

(31 - 34) _____ Grade 4 Days Present

(35 - 38) _____ Grade 4 Days Absent

(39 - 42) _____ Grade 5 Days Present

(43 - 46) _____ Grade 5 Days Absent

(47 - 50) _____ Grade 6 Days Present

(51 - 54) _____ Grade 6 Days Absent

(55 - 56) _____ Self Concept Score - 1st administration

(57 - 60) _____ Date Self Concept Test was first given (Use numbers)
Month Year

(61 - 62) _____ Self Concept Score - 2nd administration

(63 - 66) _____ Date Self Concept Test was given 2nd time (Use numbers)
Month Year

(67 - 68) _____ Self Concept Score - 3rd administration

(69 - 72) _____ Date Self Concept Test was given 3rd time (Use numbers)
Month Year

(75 - 80) _____ Project Number
(Leave blank)

Minneapolis Public Schools

Educational Services Division
Planning, Development and Federal Programs

Harry N. Vakos, PhD., Assistant Superintendent
Educational Services

Planning and Development

Lawrence P. Moon, PhD., Director of
Planning, Development and Federal
Programs

Mary C. Kasbohm, Assistant Director of
Planning, Development and Federal
Programs

Wallace J. Spolar, Fiscal Manager

Emma N. Hudson, Coordinator, Title I ESEA

Ruby M. Riney, Coordinator, Title I ESEA

Marge Hols, Dissemination Specialist

Rebecca S. Howard, Dissemination Specialist

Research and Evaluation

Richard W. Faunce, PhD., Director for Research

Lary R. Johnson, Research Associate

Robert L. Bergeth, PhD., Title I Evaluator

Sara H. Clark, Title I Evaluator